

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	0.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/681,205		10/09/2003	Syozo Kobayashi	243895US0DIV	5872	
22850	7590	12/13/2006		EXAMINER		
		LELLAND	TUCKER, ZACHARY C			
•	OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ALEXAN				1624		
				DATE MAILED: 12/13/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
*	10/681,205	KOBAYASHI ET AL.						
Notice of Abandonment	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Zachary C. Tucker	1624						
The MAILING DATE of this communication app			dress					
This application is abandoned in view of:		·						
	. lawar arailad an 5 <sup>th</sup> luna 2006							
<ol> <li>Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2006.</li> <li>A reply was received on (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time of month(s)) which expired on</li> </ol>								
(b) A proposed reply was received on, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection.								
(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C	Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); of							
(c) A reply was received on but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below).								
(d) 🛮 No reply has been received.								
<ol> <li>Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-8)</li> </ol>		the statutory period	of three months					
<ul> <li>(a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was</li></ul>	received on (with a Certification							
(b) The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance	e of \$ is due.							
The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ 1	The publication fee, if required by 37	CFR 1.18(d), is \$	·					
(c) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.								
3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).								
(a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on after the expiration of the period for reply.	(with a Certificate of Mailing or Tran	smission dated	), which is					
(b) \( \sum \) No corrected drawings have been received.								
<ol> <li>The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the the applicants.</li> </ol>	e attorney or agent of record, the assi	gnee of the entire in	nterest, or all of					
<ol> <li>The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.</li> </ol>	attorney or agent (acting in a repres	entative capacity ur	nder 37 CFR					
<ol> <li>The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claim</li> </ol>		e the period for see	king court review					
7. 🔀 The reason(s) below:								
See Continuation Sheet		•						
Petition & Tell & Trock Er 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdra	w the holding of abandonment under 37 (	CFR 1.181, should be	promptly filed to					
minimize any negative effects on patent term.								

**Continuation Sheet (PTOL-1432)** 

**Application No. 10/681,205** 

Item 7 - Other reasons for holding abandonment: A telephone call to applicants' counsel, Mr. Daniel Pereira, was made on 7th December 2006. A message was left with the receptionist, for Mr. Pereira, in which the examiner asked whether any reply to the outstanding Office action had been submitted before 6th December 2006. Mr. Pereira later that day returned the call and spoke with the examiner, stating that the lack of a reply to the Office action was intentional and applicants understand that the application would be held abandoned..